

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-6, 8-15 and 17-23 remain in the application, all of which stand rejected. Claims 7 and 16 have been cancelled.

Claims 1, 12, 19 and 22 have been amended. Support for the amendments to these claims may be found in at least original claim 7 and paragraphs [0015]-[0018] of the specification.

Claim 20 has been amended to correct a minor typographical error.

Claims 24 and 25 are newly added, support for which may be found in at least original claim 1 and paragraphs [0015]-[0018] of the specification.

None of the above amendments add new matter.

1. Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102(e)

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 12-15, 19, 20, 22 and 23 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent Application No. 2003/0005130 A1 of Cheng.

As amended, claim 1 recites that, “the reservation time period [is] determined based on a command type of the device command”. As such, the Examiner’s rejection of claim 1 is believed to be rendered moot. Although Cheng teaches RESERVE and RELEASE commands having message bodies that specify a “starting time” and an “ending time” of a “reservation time period”, Cheng provides no indication that a “reservation time period” is determined based on a “command type”. Rather, Cheng only teaches that a “reservation time period” may be determined from explicitly specified starting and ending times. Claim 1 is therefore believed to be allowable.

Claims 3-6 and 8-10 are believed to be allowable, at least, because they depend from claim 1. Claims 19, 20, 22 and 23 are believed to be allowable, at least, for reasons similar to why claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

As amended, claim 12 recites the setting of a predefined reservation time period, with the "predefined reservation time period not being specified by the first device command". As such, the Examiner's rejection of claim 12 is believed to be rendered moot. Although Cheng teaches the setting of a "reservation time period", the bounds of the reservation time period are set based on a "starting time" and an "ending time" that are explicitly specified within a RESERVE or RELEASE command. Cheng provides no indication that a "reservation time period" may be based on something not specified by a device command.

Furthermore, and by the Examiner's own admission, "[Cheng] does not set forth the limitation of further comprising upon receiving a second device command from the first host, resetting the reservation time period." See, 10/7/2005 Office Action, p. 4, sec. 14. Although the Examiner asserts that the resetting of a reservation time period would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, applicant asserts that it would not have been obvious in the context of applicant's claimed invention. If the Examiner persists in this rejection, applicant requests that the Examiner present a reference to substantiate this rejection.

Claim 12 is believed to be allowable for at least the above reasons.

Claims 13-15 are believed to be allowable, at least, because they depend from claim 12.

2. Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 2, 11, 17, 18 and 21 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Application No. 2003/0005130 A1 of Cheng.

Claims 2, 11, 17, 18 and 21 are believed to be allowable, at least, because they depend from other allowable claims. See, Section 1 of these Remarks / Arguments.

3. New Claims

Claims 24 and 25 are presented for examination for the first time.

Claim 24 is believed to be allowable, at least, for reasons similar to why claim 12 is believed to be allowable.

Claim 25 is believed to be allowable, at least, because Cheng does not teach, "setting a reservation time period for expiration of the reservation, the reservation time period being set to begin running after the device command has executed."

4. Conclusion

In summary, the art of record does not teach nor suggest the subject matter of applicant's claims 1-6, 8-15 and 17-25. These claims are therefore believed to be allowable, and accordingly, applicant respectfully requests the issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
DAHL & OSTERLOTH, L.L.P.

By: 

Gregory W. Osterloth
Reg. No. 36, 232
Tel: (303) 291-3200